

Food & Consumer Safety Study Group

December 3, 2008 10 am – 5:30 pm

Room 123, UM Helena, 1115 N. Roberts, Helena

Study Group Members Attending:

Cam Shipp, Jerry Cormier, Laurel Riek, Shannon McDonald, Jennifer Pinnow, Susan Brueggeman, Howard Reid, Joe Russell, Jane Smilie, Tim Roark, Shannon Therriault, Dale McBride (acting as a member until a bureau chief is hired)

Additional Attendees:

Tim Reed, Stacy Wilson, Camie Zufelt, Barb Sliva, Christine Cox, Leah Merchant, Julie Benson-Rosston (facilitator)

Welcome & Introductions	Julie welcomed the group and had attendees introduce themselves. Jane noted that Dale McBride is acting as the Food & Consumer Safety Section supervisor, until the position is filled.
Agenda, Ground Rules and Mission Statement Review	There were no changes to the agenda, and nothing new added to the ground rules list. The study group mission statement was reviewed.
Roles & Responsibilities of the Group	<p>Julie led the group in a review of the group's roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>What was the time/participation commitment requested?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• attend meetings• do homework• communicate with constituents• have a positive attitude toward change <p>How do we do a good job with communication?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• post information on the FCS website• email documents and meeting information• maintain communication with lead local public health officials and sanitarians <p>How have study group members been communicating since the last meeting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Informed county sanitarians of meeting activities and discussions.• Plan to share information at the next Northwest sanitarians meeting• Sharing information at team meetings• Some constituents have said they don't feel the need to be informed, as they can find the information on the FCS website if they are interested.• One group member has been contacted by a few people, and has shared documents; more people are becoming aware of the website.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hope to communicate with the local BOH and share what is being done. • Feedback from small counties hasn't been received; positive comments about web. • Some are sharing information informally, on the phone and/or emails as needed <p>The group essentially said that the communication occurs a little differently in differing counties; Julie suggested that at the end of each meeting, the group could create a list of the main discussion points to share with constituents.</p> <p>Are there regular communications with MEHA? What are the group's opportunities to communicate with MEHA?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on the study group could be added to the newsletter. • The MEHA website could link to the FCS website. <p>Are there other groups that should have regular communication from FCS? Joe indicated he would follow up with AMPHO.</p> <p>In what other ways can the communication process be improved?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revisit the idea of involving another small county. • Move the meeting around to other sites for additional membership and outreach; having a 'voice from the field'. (A 'voice from the field' is planned for the January 8 meeting.)
<p>Is there enough representation from other counties and/or other agencies?</p>	<p>There was consensus that because other agencies would like to be informed, or might have some opposition to the issues broached by the study group, it's best to involve those groups early in the process. Involving other agencies and industry representatives will help ensure that the history and reasoning for future changes is understood.</p> <p>After some discussion, the group determined the following agencies/groups should be involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ; Joe will follow up with Tom Livers, DEQ Deputy Director) • DPHHS Quality Assurance Division (QAD; Jane will follow up with Roy Kemp, QAD Division Administrator) • Two industry representatives (in total) will be solicited from the Retail Food Association, the Restaurant Association, and the Innkeepers Association. An application process will be developed to solicit those who are most interested in taking part. A draft of this letter/application process is scheduled to occur before the January 8 meeting, with the goal of having new members at the table. • Other ways to involve industry were discussed (e.g. the possibility of

	<p>sending out surveys to industry and others in the regulated community). This discussion was tabled—to be revisited at a subsequent meeting.</p>																																
LBIF payments to locals	<p>DPHHS staff shared information with the study group on local board inspection funds (LBIF), and answered questions.</p> <p>Dale and Jane proposed a new scheme that would pay as follows:</p> <table><tr><th colspan="4">LBIF Disbursement by Percentage</th></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><th>Total Revenue Received for Paid License</th><th>Percent of County Inspections</th><th>LBIF Disbursement by Percentage</th><th>LBIF Funds Disburse</th></tr><tr><td>\$ 10,000</td><td>90% -100%</td><td>100%</td><td>\$ 10,000</td></tr><tr><td>\$ 10,000</td><td>85% - 89%</td><td>90%</td><td>\$ 9,000</td></tr><tr><td>\$ 10,000</td><td>80% - 84%</td><td>85%</td><td>\$ 8,500</td></tr><tr><td>\$ 10,000</td><td>75% - 79%</td><td>83%</td><td>\$ 8,300</td></tr><tr><td>\$ 10,000</td><td>74% - 0%</td><td>Percentage of Inspections</td><td></td></tr></table> <p>The group agreed with this payment scheme and DPHHS will work to get a policy in place to do this that can be reviewed at the next meeting.</p> <p>There was consensus that the current payment rules are unclear; with different inspection and payment situations applying to different counties. Written protocols for payment must be in place. Simple cooperative agreements could be established, to address the confusion, increase clarity, and improve relationships.</p>	LBIF Disbursement by Percentage								Total Revenue Received for Paid License	Percent of County Inspections	LBIF Disbursement by Percentage	LBIF Funds Disburse	\$ 10,000	90% -100%	100%	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	85% - 89%	90%	\$ 9,000	\$ 10,000	80% - 84%	85%	\$ 8,500	\$ 10,000	75% - 79%	83%	\$ 8,300	\$ 10,000	74% - 0%	Percentage of Inspections	
LBIF Disbursement by Percentage																																	
Total Revenue Received for Paid License	Percent of County Inspections	LBIF Disbursement by Percentage	LBIF Funds Disburse																														
\$ 10,000	90% -100%	100%	\$ 10,000																														
\$ 10,000	85% - 89%	90%	\$ 9,000																														
\$ 10,000	80% - 84%	85%	\$ 8,500																														
\$ 10,000	75% - 79%	83%	\$ 8,300																														
\$ 10,000	74% - 0%	Percentage of Inspections																															
Roll up of each county Camie	<p>How many fees received, number of establishments inspected at least once to attach to those fees. Additional topics of discussion included: how numbers are configured; gold systems, standardization, quarterly reports, and license numbers. The group also discussed what processes might work better to ensure that payments are made appropriately and efficiently. Both state and local staff expressed frustration with the current systems; Jane explained that a possible trial solution would be explained later in the meeting.</p>																																
Lunch/Public Comment Period	<p>No formal public comments were made at this time.</p>																																
Department and Division Org Charts	<p>Department and Division Org Charts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 3000 of the 11,000 state employees are in DPHHS• PHSD is one of 10 divisions• Food & Consumer Safety is located in Communicable Disease Control & Prevention Bureau																																

Videoconference with Paula O'Brien	<p>Paula posed four questions to the group, and Julie facilitated questions/answers.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are you satisfied with the framework and principles as the model to be used to revise Montana's food safety laws? Are there are principles or concepts which should be added in? 2. What about the current laws works well? >>We should think about keeping these laws. 3. What about the current laws works poorly? When is the law unclear or confusing? When does the law require you to do things which are not practical or helpful? >>We need something better. 4. Where are the gaps in the law? Are there things you are doing at present which you do not have authority to do or you are unsure whether you have authority to do? >>We need to develop some law to cover these situations
Proposal for appropriate reimbursement	<p>Dale & Jane discussed a temporary proposal until something more long-term could be established.</p> <p>Discussion occurred regarding the difficulty of the calendar and fiscal years, with everyone realizing this isn't going to change, but should be managed better.</p>
Food Safety at the National/Federal Level Next steps:	<p>Joe Russell reported on food safety activities and groups at the federal level, including CIFOR: Council to Improve Foodborne Outbreak and Response www.cifor.us</p> <p>Joe's presentation is posted on the study group website.</p>
January 8 meeting	The January 8 meeting will be held in Helena, from 10 am – 5:00 pm. The meeting will be held at the same location, in room 123 at the UM Helena/College of Technology.
March 17 & 18 meeting	The group discussed holding a meeting in March over 2 days: March 17 from 1-5 pm, and March 18 from 8 am -3 pm.
Evaluation of the December 3 meeting	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impressed by scope of identified issues • Ability to discuss a sensitive issue and work through it. • Productive conversation about including additional members (state agencies, industry, etc). • Productive use of time, moved forward. • Good room size. • Decent location. • Appreciation for pro-active work that Dale, Jane, and staff did on fee structure, as well as administration's commitment to work/process • Good changes. • Improved group dynamics; coalescing into a good task force.

	<p>Room for improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A few weeks advance to review discussion questions.• Create a survey with Paula's questions, send to sanitarians and lead local health officials. In the meantime, send a copy of the summary of the Oct. 9 meeting to Paula—may give her additional info/insight.• In meeting summary from MEHA, is there anything that would apply to Paula's questions? (Oct 8)• At subsequent meetings, have a <i>quick</i> recap of the previous meeting.• Talk about things in specifics, rather than very broad questions.• Some agenda items were tabled due to time; at next meeting, discuss IT and legal resources available to FCSS.• Should we invite someone from One Stop in order to ask specific questions, with Barb available for discussion/answers/input.
--	--